

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 220000000669

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Central Procurement Services office has completed the evaluation of RFP 220000002034 for the Health Professional Recovery Program and has recommended an award to Ulliance, Inc. in the amount of \$7,026,424.41, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Marissa Gove, Solicitation Manager.

Govem1@michigan.gov

517-449-8952

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide services for the Health Professional Recovery Program. The term of this contract is three (3) years, with up to two (2) additional one (1) year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on April 15, 2022, for 42 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of May 27, 2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
Park Pharmacy Inc.	220 W Congress, Floor 2 PMB #220, Detroit, MI 48226	No
Parkdale Aftercare, LLC	350 Indian Boundary Rd., Chesterton, IN 46304	No
Ulliance, Inc.	900 Tower Drive, Suite 600, Troy, MI 48098	No

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Vendor Questions Worksheet (Experience)	30
2.	Vendor Questions Worksheet (Except Experience)	4
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	46
4.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4	45
5.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10	15
	Total	140

Proposals receiving 112 or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by a Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Marissa Gove, Category Analyst DTMB CPS	Brandon Samuel, State Assistant Administrator DTMB CPS
Kerry Przybylo, State Administrative Manager LARA	Mike Bartkowiak, IT Security Architect DTMB
Dena Marks, Departmental Specialist LARA	Heather Laurin, Departmental Specialist DTMB
	Brenda Davis, Departmental Specialist LARA

III. Evaluation Results

A. Park Pharmacy

The Evaluation Team determined that Park Pharmacy, based on a score of 112, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Vendor Questions Worksheet (Experience)** **6/30**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly unsatisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:
 1. Experiences 1, 2, and 3 are not of similar scope for this RFP.
 2. Experiences 1 and 2 do not demonstrate an adequate length of time.

2. **Vendor Questions Worksheet (Except Experience)** **4/4**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

3. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1** **46/46**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

4. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4** **41/45**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 1. The reference information provided in Attachment D was outdated to current standards and there was no mention of compliance for RecoveryTrek with federal standards required by the State.
 2. The bidder's response lacked details related to IT database backup and recovery processes and the root cause analysis and lessons learned follow up was not included.

5. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10** **15/15**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

Total Score: 112/140

B. Parkdale

The Evaluation Team determined that Parkdale, based on a score of 112, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Vendor Questions Worksheet (Experience)** **24/30**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 1. Experiences 1, 2, and 3 are not of similar size for this RFP.

2. **Vendor Questions Worksheet (Except Experience)** **4/4**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

3. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1** **34/46**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

1. The bidder checked the box that noted exceptions but did not provide what the exceptions were (Pages 41, 44, 47, 53, 54, 58, 61, 63, 66, 71).
2. The procedures proposed under B. Task 4: Case Monitoring Services were not consistent with the HPRP policies .
3. The bidder did not describe how they would identify gaps in the State where more treatment providers are needed for G. Task 9: HPRP Treatment Service Provider Network.

4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4 35/45

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

1. The bidder checked the box that noted exceptions but did not provide what the exceptions were (Pages 76, 77, 78, 79, 89).
2. The bidder provided an outline of what their Disaster Recovery Plan could include but not an actual plan.

5. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

Total Score: 112/140

C. Ulliance

The Evaluation Team determined that Parkdale, based on a score of 112, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Questions Worksheet (Experience) 30/30

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

2. Vendor Questions Worksheet (Except Experience) 4/4

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 46/46

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4 43/45

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

1. The bidder's response lacked detail related to IT database backup and recovery processes and the RTO in the Disaster Recovery Plan does

not meet the requirements outlined in the RFP.

- 5. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10** **15/15**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

Total Score: 138/140

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Selection Criteria		Park Pharmacy	Parkdale	Ulliance
1	Vendor Questions Worksheet (Experience)	6	24	30
2	Vendor Questions Worksheet (Except Experience)	4	4	4
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	46	34	46
4	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4	41	35	43
5	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10	15	15	15
	Total	112	112	138

V. Pricing Summary

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

Deliverable	Park Pharmacy	Park Pharmacy (2nd Round)	Parkdale	Parkdale (2nd Round)	Ulliance	Ulliance (2nd Round)
Salaries and Wages	\$4,868,604	\$4,290,156	\$4,288,979	\$4,291,719	\$4,959,581.97	\$4,909,986.15
Fringe Benefits	\$1,059,870	\$1,096,950	\$928,564	\$798,722	\$1,224,724.92	\$1,212,477.69
Travel	\$177,984	\$190,344	\$312,161	\$275,436	\$18,000	\$17,820
Supplies and Materials	\$185,400	\$185,400	\$56,725	\$63,767	\$36,000	\$35,640
Contractual (Subcontracts)	\$1,012,902	\$1,562,851.50	\$76,510	\$61,208	\$454,255.11	\$449,712.57
Equipment	\$247,200	\$247,200	\$51,412	\$51,412	\$54,000	\$53,460
Other Expenses	\$718,425	\$417,150	\$279,718	\$277,718	\$39,000	\$38,610
Total Direct Expenditures (Total of above)	\$8,270,385	\$7,990,051.50	\$5,994,069	\$5,819,982	\$6,785,562	\$6,717,706.41
Indirect Costs/Administrative Overhead	\$1,124,760	\$1,124,760	\$649,089	\$649,089	\$312,000	\$308,718
Total Expenditures (Total Direct plus Indirect)	\$9,395,145	\$9,114,811.50	\$6,643,158	\$6,469,071	\$7,097,562	\$7,026,424.41

VI. Negotiations

All bidders offered a price decrease in the second-round pricing as exhibited in the table above.

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, providing adequate experiences, and price.

Ulliance provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include: Experience providing monitoring services to health care providers suffering from a substance use disorder, mental health disorder, or both; Expertise of their medical director and size and scope of past experiences.

As part of the best value determination, overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered and is not a determinative factor in making this award.

Award Recommendation is made to Ulliance in the amount of \$7,026,424.41.